

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are in the case and presented for consideration.

Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice to Applicant's right to pursue the canceled subject matter in a continuing application.

Claims 1-7 has been written to clarify the operational and structural arrangement of the claimed invention. Corresponding passages of the specification have also been amended to reflect the changes made to the claims.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found, for example, in Figs. 1-3 and 8-16. Support for the amendments to claim 2 can be found, for example, in Fig. 7 and paragraph [0037] of the published application. Support for the amendments to claim 3 can be found, for example, in Figs. 1-3 and paragraph [0033] of the published application. Support for the amendments to claim 4 can be found, for example, in Figs. 4-6 and paragraphs [0034-35] of the published application. Support for the amendments to claim 5 can be found, for example, in Figs. 11 and 15, and paragraphs [0045-56] of the published application. Support for the amendments to claim 6 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0047] of the published application. Support for the amendments to claim 7 can be found, for example, in Fig. 7 and paragraph [0037] of the published application.

New claims 9 and 15 correspond to claim 7. New claim 10 corresponds to claims 1 and 3. New claim 11 corresponds to claim 2. New claim 12 corresponds to claim 4. New claim 13 corresponds to claim 1 and 5. New claim 14 corresponds to claim 6.

Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,839,576 to Aagaard, et al. ("Aagaard"). Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aagaard in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 20030064758 ("Mizuta, et al."). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aagaard and Mizuta, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,965,413 to Wada. See June 7, 2006 Office Action, pages 2-4, sections 2-4.

The Examiner states that the invention recited in claim 1 is disclosed in "figures 1-6 [of the Aagaard reference] and their descriptions." See June 7, 2006 Office Action, page 2, section 2.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above-noted rejections.

To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every feature of the claimed invention.

Applicant's independent claim 1 now recites:

A portable terminal device comprising:
a first member in a plane having a keyboard operation portion;
a coupling member connected to said first member so as to be
movable in said plane; and
a second member pivotally attached to said coupling member and movable into a pivotally supporting position to allow a side face and/or rear face of said second member to be directed forward relative to said coupling member, said second member having a display portion on a front face and a lens portion of a camera on the side face and/or rear face;
wherein said pivotally supporting position of said second member is a position that said second member can rotate relative to said coupling member about a pivot axis parallel to said plane, and after said coupling member moves said second member in said plane relative to said first

member to said pivotally supporting position, said first member and said second member lie along a straight line.

It is respectfully submitted that Aagaard fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-underlined features of claim 1. In particular, Aagaard is missing a ***coupling member*** connected to a first member established in a plane, and configured to move in said plane with respect to the first member.

Accordingly, claim 1 is distinguished over the prior art and is believed to be allowable. Claims 2-7 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and therefore contain the features recited in claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons given above for claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claims 1-7 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as also being anticipated U.S. Patent 5,661,641 to Shindo.

The Examiner states that the invention recited in claim 1 is disclosed in “figures 8-13 [of the Shindo reference] and their descriptions.” See June 7, 2006 Office Action, page 5, section 5.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above-noted rejection.

Applicant maintains that Shindo also fails to disclose a ***coupling member*** as well as “a ***second member pivotally attached to said coupling member*** and ***movable into a pivotally supporting position to allow a side face and/or rear face of said second member to be directed forward relative to said coupling member***”.

Accordingly, claim 1 is distinguished over the prior art and is believed to be

allowable. Claims 3-5 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and therefore contain the features recited in claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons given above for claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claims 1 and 3-5 is therefore respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below to advance the application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chih-Sheng Lin/
Reg. No. 56,402
Attorney for Applicant
(845) 359-7700

Dated: October 4, 2006

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706